<u>REMARKS/ARGUMENTS</u>

The Examiner is thanked for review of the prior art and consideration of the arguments presented.

No claims have been added, cancelled, or amended. Hence, Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-15, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0254948 to Yao (hereinafter "Yao").

Claims 3, 4, 6, 10-12, 16, 18, 22-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0021929 to Lin et al. (hereinafter "Lin").

Claims 13 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao in further view of Lin.

Claims 5 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,670 to Inohara et al. (hereinafter "Inohara").

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-15, and 19-21 were rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0254948 to Yao (hereinafter "Yao").

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP 2131 "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either

expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Id., Verdegaal Bros.v.Union

Oil Co.of California, 814 F.2d 628,631,2 USPQ2d 1051,1053

The claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or motivated by Yao. Claims 1 and 14

share the following language:

> **a database server receiving a request to execute a database statement, wherein the request specifies the database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language;**
> **wherein said tag specifies at least one parameter field and at least one parameter value;**
> **in response to receiving the request, said database server storing the tag;**
> **said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server.**

Yao does not teach, suggest, or motivate, "said database server executing said database

statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides

access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism

provided by said database server." In Yao, the ETL driver module converts a first set of

instructions into a second set of instructions. See page 5, paragraph 51. As described below,

Yao does not use tags or make tags accessible after the second set of instructions is generated.

In the claimed invention, said database server provides access "during execution of said

database statement." Yao does not teach, suggest, or motivate providing access "during

execution of said database statement."

Yao presents a "system and method for data ETL in a data warehouse environment."

Figure 4 of Yao provides a good overview of the text. A first set of ETL instructions is parsed

from the ETL SQL file 440 by a controller 450 (see page 4, paragraph 49), and sent to the ETL

driver module 460. The ETL driver module 460 then sends command instruction tags from the

first set of ETL instructions to the SQL decomposition database 465. See page 4, paragraph 49.

The SQL decomposition database "match[es] the command tags [t]o command tags in the SQL decomposition database 465 [so that] associated command instructions may be identified." The ETL driver module 460 then uses the command instructions to generate the second set of ETL instructions. See page 5, paragraph 51. At this point, the instructions have not been executed.

Then, after the instructions have been translated from a first set of instructions to a second set of instructions, Yao explains that the second set of ETL instructions "are used to perform operations on the operational data of the enterprise transient system 410." See page 5, paragraph 51. As a result, "[t]he second set of ETL instructions are performed in a more efficient manner than the first set of ETL instructions by minimizing the amount of log space and processing time necessary to perform the ETL operations." Thus, the tags disclosed are used only to convert a first set of ETL instructions into a more efficient second set of ETL instructions.

The tags in Yao are not used by the enterprise transient system. Also, the tags in Yao are not used after the second set of ETL instructions has been created. Similarly, the tags in Yao are not accessible to the enterprise transient system during execution. In fact, the tags in Yao are not used at all during execution.

In the claimed invention, unlike Yao, "said tag specifies at least one parameter field and at least one parameter value," and "during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server."

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

The Final Office Action combined Lin and Inohara with Yao for obviousness rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Lin and Inohara are merely cumulative with the background of Applicant's specification discussing optimizer hints and user context.

Neither Lin nor Inohara teach, suggest, or motivate that "during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server."

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: September 19, 2008

/EricLSutton#61173/

Eric L. Sutton
Reg. No. 61,173

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1080 ext. 210
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

OID-2003-249-01   5